UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/410,334	10/01/1999	AUBREY MCAULEY	ADHE1100	6725

25094 7590 07/17/2002

GRAY, CARY, WARE & FREIDENRICH LLP
1221 SOUTH MOPAC EXPRESSWAY
SUITE 400
AUSTIN, TX 78746-6875

EXAMINER	
CHAVIS, JOHN Q	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/410,334	MCAULEY, AUBREY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Q. Chavis	2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 October 1999* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *5* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1-8, 11-18, 20-21, 25-40, 42-44, 47, 50-51, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson (6,052,670). The applicant's invention pertains to a method and system of generating computer applications from a framework. The features of the applicant's claims are now presented in a side by side manner with the teachings of Johnson.

Claims	Johnson
_ 1. A method for generating computer application on a host system in an arbitrary object framework that separates a content of said computer application, a form of said computer application and a functionality of said computer applications, said method comprising:	see the title, abstract and figs 11-12, with content represented via the TOC page (table of content page), form represented in the ContentPage (left of the TOC page) via the various layouts enclosed and the functionality represented via the Catalog (methods). The details of the Catalog is indicated in fig. 12, which Specifies the class used to inherently create specific objects, col. 12 lines 45-52 and col. 6 lines 54-61. Objects are inherently separate and Johnson's specific classes further illustrates the feature.

creating arbitrary objects with corresponding arbitrary names of various object types for generating said content of said computer application, said form of said computer application, and said functionality of said computer application;	Objects in an object oriented environment are inherently arbitrary to provide for the specific details of the application. As per the TOC page above, corresponding arbitrary names are specified to identify and enable access to the various objects, see again the abstract. Also, the various objects listed above are created as indicated via col. 1 lines 35-60, col. 14 lines 11-22 and the referenced portion above.
managing said arbitrary objects from said object library; and	furthermore, objects and functions (functionality) are provided names to enable communication (managing) between objects, col. 11 lines 18-22, and col. 14 lines 23-39. The library feature (framework) enables quick and easy reusability, col. 1 lines 36-47, col. 4 lines 58-61 and col. 1 lines 48-60.
deploying said arbitrary objects from said object library into a design framework to create said software application.	see col. 3 lines 49-67, col. 4 lines 20-34 and col. 4 lines 58-66, which indicates that cooperating (arbitrary) Objects are selected (deployed) from the problem domain (abstract view or abstract framework) into a specific design framework (for example, the Zoo Administration Framework Taught by Johnson) to create the application.
2. The method of claim 1, wherein said computer application is a web site.	see col. 2 lines 10-67 in which Johnson refers to his system as an Electronic (for online (web) or offline use) catalog.
3. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise text file pointers.	this feature is considered inherent to enable access to the descriptions of Items in the catalog, col. 2 lines 10-

	46.
4. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise binary file pointers.	see the digital links to catalog data in col. 16 lines 39-61 and col. 20 Lines 38-45. Also see col. 22 lines 20-30.
5. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise executables.	see col. 7 lines 9-18, and 37-41.
6. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise shell commands.	this feature is considered inherent via the search commands and the Access commands, col. 21 lines 64- col. 22 lines 10.
7. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise remote procedure calls.	see col. 16 lines 19-38.
8. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise global variables.	this feature is considered inherent in object oriented Systems to identify variables that are generic (common features) to all subclasses and therefore not changed in subclasses, see col. 2 lines 47-56 and col. 8 lines 22-35 and col. 10 lines 4-21, which speaks of overriding data in subclasses. The data that is not overridden is inherently global to the subclass that does not provide it's own definition.
11. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise local variables.	see the discussion in claim 8, the data that is overridden or new in Subclasses is local to the subclass.
12. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise local objects and global parent objects.	see the rejections of claims 8 and 11.
13. The method of claim 12, wherein	see again the rejections of claims

said local objects can override said global parent objects.	8 and 11.
14. The method of claim 12, wherein said local objects inherit data from said global parent objects.	see the rejections of claims 8 and 11.
15. The method of claim 1, wherein said local objects inherit capabilities from said global parent objects.	see again the rejection of claims 8 and 11.
16. The method of claim 1, further comprising arbitrary objects globally.	see again the rejection of claims 8 and 11.
17. The method of claim 1, further comprising arbitrary objects locally.	see again the rejection of claims 8 and 11.
18. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of managing said arbitrary Objects further comprises revision Tracking.	see the overriding functions which enables updates (revisions), col. 2 lines 47-56 and col. 13 lines 43-50, and provides information (tracking) via the metaclass, which provides information about objects.
20. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of managing further comprises using signoff.	This feature is considered inherent via the sign in feature via password Verifications, col. 19 lines 1-22 and col. 22 lines 2-10.
21. The method of claim 1, wherein said arbitrary objects can be accessed and deployed into said design framework using said corresponding arbitrary names.	see the rejection of claim 1.
25. The method of claim 1, further comprising generating arbitrary objects in a programming language that is compatible or supported by said host system.	This feature is considered inherent in that Johnson's system utilizes a common interface (col. 8 line 56-col. 9 line 16. Also, once Modified objects are compiled (on the host system) compatibility is inherent.

The features of claims 26-32 are taught via the rejections of claims 2-8.

As per claims 33-36, see the rejections of claims 11-14.

In reference to claims 37-40, see claims 15-18.

The features of claims 42-44 are taught via claims 20-22.

As per claim 47, see the rejection of claim 25.

In reference to claim 50-51, see the access Profile class in col. 21 line 64-col. 22 line 10.

The features of claim 53 are indicated via Johnson's catalog (syndicated) feature.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 9-10, 19 and 22-24, 41, 45-46, 48-49, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Gish (6,253,282) who teach providing caching to speed access time, using rollback to compensate for errors in subclasses via his event handling means and swapping objects when a different type is required or needed.

Claims	Johnson/Gish
9. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise cached executables.	Johnson does not specifically teach the use of cached executables; However, he teach the use of executables as indicated in the rejection of claim 5. Gish teach the use of a cache, see the abstract, to speed up data access time and it would have been obvious to a person of

	ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Johnson's system with Gish's caching of data to increase execution speed.
10. The method of claim 1, wherein said various object types comprise cached database queries.	in reference to the database queries, see col. 20 lines 38-45 And in reference to the caching of data see claim 9.
19. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of managing said arbitrary objects further comprises using rollback.	Although Johnson does not specifically indicate that rollback is used, the feature is considered A standard feature for correcting errors to ensure that previous updates are not lost. Gish teach handling events that occur as a program executes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the feature of handling events taught by Gish (col. 36 line 50-col. 38 line 52) in Johnson's system when the validator, col. 27 lines 14-15, encounters errors to ensure that previously validated data is not lost. Gish enables the creation of specific handlers and therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a rollback to reduce update time.
22. The method of claim 1, further comprising swapping an arbitrary object of one type with an arbitrary object of another type.	Johnson does not specifically teach that objects of one type are swapped for objects of Another type; however, he does indicate that objects are selected as needed from the problem domain. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to select different types when different

	types are needed to solve a specific problem.
23. The method of claim 1, further comprising caching objects.	see the rejections of claim 9 and 10.
24. The method of claim 23, wherein the step of caching objects further comprises specifying some elements of an arbitrary object to be dynamic elements and specifying some elements of said arbitrary to be static elements.	see the rejections of claims 9 and 10 in view of col. 7 lines 9-36 for dynamic elements; while, col. 7 line 60-col. 8 line 21 indicates core functions that inherently operate on core (static or global Data).

In reference to claim 41, see the rejection of claim 19.

As per claims 45-46, see the rejection of claims 23-24.

In reference to claim 48-49, see claims 9-10.

The features of claim 52 are taught via claim 24.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Chavis whose telephone number is (703) 305-9665. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse **(New Art Unit 2124)**, can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax number for this Group is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JQC
July 15, 2002

John Chavis
Patent Examiner